


AUG 04 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Postal Service at Facsimile Number 571-273-8300.

Date of Deposit: 8/4/2005

Typed Name of Person Mailing Paper or Fax: Natalie King

Signature: 

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO. 10007843-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S): Pere Obrador et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/023,951

GROUP ART UNIT: 2612

FILED: December 21, 2001

EXAMINER: J. Hannett

SUBJECT: Remote High Resolution Photography and Video Recording Using a
Streaming Video as a View-Finder

MAIL STOP FEE AMENDMENT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Amendment C

S/N: 10/023,951
PDNO. 10007843-1
Amendment C

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10007843-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Pere Obrador et al.

Confirmation No.: 7670

Application No.: 10/023,951

Examiner: James Hannett

Filing Date: 12/21/2001

Group Art Unit: 2612

Title: Remote High Resolution Photography and Video Recording Using a Streaming Video as a View-Finder

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED
OPI/EP/A
AUG 08 2005

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 04 2005

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:


(X) Response/Amendment	() Petition to extend time to respond
() New fee as calculated below	() Supplemental Declaration
() No additional fee	
(X) Other: Interview Summary	(fee \$ _____)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS	34	MINUS	25	= 9	X \$50	\$ 450
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$200	\$ 0
[] FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ \$360	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	1ST MONTH \$120.00	2ND MONTH \$450.00	3RD MONTH \$1020.00	4TH MONTH \$1590.00		\$ 0
					OTHER FEES	\$
					TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT	\$ 450

Charge \$ 450 to Deposit Account 08-2025. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

(X) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on 8/4/2005
Number of pages: 18

Typed Name: Natalie King

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted,

Pere Obrador et al.

By 

James D. Shaurette

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,833

Date: 8/4/05

Telephone No.: (509) 624-4276

10023951

082025

450.00 DA

08/08/2005 HGUTEMAI 00000031 082025

01 FC:1252

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Postal Service at Facsimile Number 571-273-8300.
Date of Deposit: 8/4/2005
Typed Name of Person Mailing Paper or Fee: Natalie King
Signature: 

**PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO. 10007843-1**

**IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

INVENTOR(S): Pere Obrador et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/023,951

GROUP ART UNIT: 2612

FILED: December 21, 2001

EXAMINER: J. Hannett

SUBJECT: Remote High Resolution Photography and Video Recording Using a Streaming Video as a View-Finder

**MAIL STOP FEE AMENDMENT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1450**

Interview Summary A

Sir:

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Hannett and Supervisor Thai Tran for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephonic interview of July 19, 2005. The Office reiterated its position that col. 2 of Ramasubramanian provides motivational rationale for combining the reference teachings where both references concern communicating video and it would be obvious to include the snapshot function of Ramasubramanian in Mottur without identification of further evidence to support the motivational rationale. The undersigned stated that the differences of the references regarding controlling the web cam of Mottur and accessing previously stored video from a file of Ramasubramanian illustrate the inappropriateness of the combination.

The Office reiterated its position set forth in the Action with respect to claim 23 that different slots may be broadly considered to be different channels.

The undersigned and the Office discussed the limitations of claim 28 indicated to be allowable. During the discussions, the Office favorably received limitations of acquiring of a photograph during the original generation of the video and indicated such limitations may be allowed pending further and/or updated search. Additional points discussed are provided in the response which accompanies this interview summary.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,
Pere Obrador et al.

By


James D. Shaurette

Reg. No. 39,833

Date: 8/4/05

(509) 624-4276

PDNO. 10007843-1 2
Serial No. 10/023,951
Interview Summary A